

REMARKS

I. Introduction

In response to the Office Action dated November 28, 2005, Applicants have amended claim 6 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Claims 26 – 31 have each been amended to be in independent format in order to overcome the claim objections. Claim 12 has been canceled.

Applicants note with appreciation the allowance of claims 1 – 5, and 13 – 25, and the indication that claims 7, 8, and 26 – 31 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

II. Claim Objections

Claims 26 – 31 are objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c) as allegedly being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicants have rewritten each of claims 26 – 31 in independent form. Accordingly, as claims 26 – 31 were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent format including the limitations of any base claims, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 26 – 31 are now in condition for allowance.

III. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 6 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,557,225 to Denham. Claim 12 has been canceled by this amendment. Applicants traverse the rejection of claim 6 for at least the following reasons.

Claim 6, as amended, recites a memory element having two outputs – a signal from a latch circuit and a signal from a variation detection circuit. At least this feature is not disclosed by Denham. The configuration of the present invention enables other circuits connected to the memory element to be notified that content of the memory element has been varied.

Denham appears to disclose a flip-flop circuit having a single output. The Examiner equates element 716, depicted in Figure 7, with the variation detection circuit recited in claim 6. Furthermore, the Examiner considers the line from element 716 to element 717 to be a variation signal, as recited in claim 6. However, even if this signal could be considered a variation signal, the signal is not an output of the flip-flop circuit.

Thus, as anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires that each element of the claim in issue be found, either expressly described or under principles of inherency, in a single prior art reference, *Kalman v. Kimberly-Clark Corp.*, 713 F.2d 760, 218 USPQ 781 (Fed. Cir. 1983), and at a minimum, Denham fails to disclose at least a memory element having two outputs – a signal from a latch circuit and a signal from a variation detection circuit, it is clear that the Denham does not anticipate claim 6. Accordingly, claim 6 is patentable over Denham.

Claims 7 and 8 depend from claim 6. Thus, as claim 6 is patentable for at least the reasons provided above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 7 and 8 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency.

IV. Conclusion

Accordingly, it is urged that the application is in condition for allowance, an indication of which is respectfully solicited.

If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is requested to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP


Michael E. Fogarty
Registration No. 36,139

Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 MEF:dab
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: February 22, 2006